



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*de Mahieu* by Matheolus of Picardy<sup>3</sup> and *Le livre des manieres* of Estienne de Fougères.<sup>4</sup> The work of Gilles li Muisis, in spite of its modern form, is neither comely nor such as to compel attention.<sup>5</sup> Certain it is that his editor, M. Kervyn de Lettenhove, stands unenviably alone in comparing the abbot Gilles to Dante; at which juncture M. Langlois comes well to the rescue when he says of the Belgian cleric: *le bonhomme n'était pas bête*.

Finally, it might be urged that in a book of this character so many references to the technical journals of Romance philology only bewilder the layman and fall short of any purpose to instruct or edify him; nevertheless, it is much better to have included the material in question than to have omitted it, owing to the fact of its intrinsic value with the context. We hazard the wish that M. Langlois may see fit to construct an entire series of such works as the one in hand; they will—all of them—be the product of a rare talent in the sphere of general philology.

F. L. CRITCHLOW.

Princeton University.

## GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Das Fähnlein der sieben Aufrechten*. Novelle von GOTTFRIED KELLER. Edited with Notes and a Vocabulary by W. G. HOWARD and A. M. STURTEVANT. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1907. Pp. iii + 170.

Keller's *Fähnlein der sieben Aufrechten* had long deserved a place among annotated school-texts, both for its intrinsic literary merit and its availability for class-use. The text as presented in the present edition is considerably abridged.

<sup>3</sup>Ed. A.-G. van Hamel, *Bibl. de l'École des Hautes-Études*, fasc. 95, 96. Paris, 1892-1905 (*Erratum* in Langlois reads: 1895.)

<sup>4</sup>Cf. J. Kremer's edition in *Ausg. und Abh.*, vol. XXXIX, Marburg, 1887.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. *Poesies de Gilles li Muisis*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove. Louvain, 1882.

While this abridgment has in a measure impaired the broad epic style of the original, and through a change in connection occasionally strains the meaning of a word or phrase, the pruning has from a pedagogical point of view been done with skill and judgment. Two passages, the taking apart of Hediger's musket and Karl's reminiscences of an earlier kissing episode, one is, however, sorry to miss. The technical character of the former of these doubtless caused its elimination, but this objection could have been met by less drastic means, and the retention of the passage would have somewhat lessened the force of the otherwise just criticism (p. 87) that Karl "is perhaps a little too much of a paragon."

There was even less reason for the omission of the second episode. It is in Keller's best vein, with a delightful humorous turn, that banishes all suggestion of sentimentality, and with the whole raised to a higher poetical level by the inimitably graceful image of the butterfly that Karl in vain seeks to clutch.

The work of editing has on the whole been carefully done. An introductory sketch dealing with Keller's career and the setting of the story is modestly made to preface the Notes. In view of the popularity which this text is reasonably certain to enjoy the following criticism of details is perhaps in place.

Page 1, l. 15, "durfte sich sehen lassen" has an entirely different connotation from "was a sight for gods and men."—p. 2, l. 7. The statement that Schiller "expressed his obligation" to Müller in *Wilhelm Tell* is hardly correct, and is bound to be misunderstood.—p. 6, l. 16. *Bilder* are *Sternbilder*, *constellations*.—p. 8, l. 10. *hässlich* is not *ugly*, *homely*, but *odious*, *detestable*, 'hateful'.—p. 9, l. 10. *fromm* is not *piously* but *gently*, *obediently*.—p. 16, l. 15. In the expression "eine längere und fast schwierige Verhandlung" the difficulty lies not in *fast*, which the editors would interpret as used in the Swiss dialectic sense of *sehr*, but in *schwierig*, which is here applied to an abstract noun in a sense that is commonly restricted to individuals, *i. e.*, *troublesome*, *vexatious*. *schwierig* with somewhat unusual shades of meaning is in fact a favorite word in Keller as the following quotations, all from *Martin Salander*, will show: "Die armen Würmer!"

dachte der Vater wiederum, "das ist eine schwierige Geschichte" (p. 111). "Du siehst, ich war auch beschäftigt; ich bin ein armer Teufel und habe stets mit dem Vermögen meiner Frau zu schaffen, es ist eine etwas schwierige Gegend dort hinten!" (p. 249). Unter diesen trieben sich die Einberufer umher, hier und da Rücksprache nehmend oder einen der schwierigeren Kannengiesser bearbeitend (p. 129).—p. 19, l. 10. The dative construction with *rufen* deserved a note.—p. 27, l. 10. The editors failed to observe the unusual construction of *während* with the dative. The Vocabulary gives it as governing the genitive only.—p. 27, l. 21. *steifen* is probably not *stiff*, *obstinate*, but *pedantic*, *formal*, *stiff*.—p. 31, l. 22. The reference in the Notes to p. 4, l. 22, does not explain the omission of the auxiliary.—p. 37, l. 16. In "als . . . Hermine hinter einer blühenden Weide hervortrat, die ganz voll gelber Kätzchen hing," *Weide* has strangely been taken to mean *pasture* instead of *willow*.—p. 40, l. 22. In "Allein sei es, . . . er blieb," the word-order is entirely regular.—p. 41, l. 27. *Spezialwaffe* refers not to the 'special branch of the service, special corps,' but to the *Stutzen* as the distinctive weapon of the special corps.—p. 51, l. 1. *Zöpfe* requires a note. "Jetzt sind die Demokraten oben und gelten für schneidig; die Altliberalen werden schon von ihnen Zöpfe genannt," remarks a character in *Martin Salander*. Similarly, "Prosit Anstrich, Herr Altliberaler, vulgo Zopfius!"—p. 53, ll. 11-14. The passage requires comment. Thus *Verdummung* (Vocabulary, 'stupification, brutalization, oppression'), which contains in it the fling that the Catholic party stands in the way of the enlightenment of the masses, remains entirely unintelligible in the light of either the Vocabulary or the statement on pp. 86-87.—p. 59, l. 10. The "gentlemen in black" are not "clergymen" (Vocabulary under *schwarz*) but the gentlemen of the receiving committee. Compare the references p. 61, ll. 4-7, and p. 63, l. 25.—p. 61, l. 15. The position of *lacht* calls for comment.—p. 80, l. 15. *weil* is *so long as* not *because*.—p. 120. *Fort-schrittsmann* is used in a technical sense and is *progressist* rather than *progressive man*.—p. 123. *geistig* also occurs in the sense of *intellectual* in the story.

Words omitted in the Vocabulary are: *rein* (p. 22, l. 3), *wohlgetan* (p. 58, l. 12), *taktfest* (p. 58, l. 25), *schenken* (p. 62, l. 1), *Schar* (p. 76, l. 24). The following misprints have been noticed: *alsalb*, p. 18, l. 7.—last words of ll. 6-7, p. 56.—p. 95. Read "Page 64.—1. geblieben" for "2. geblieben."—p. 106, *whispers* for *whiskers*.

B. J. Vos.

Indiana University.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY OF FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Guide bibliographique de la littérature française de 1800 à 1905*, par Hugo P. Thieme. Paris: Welter, 1907.

Professor Hugo P. Thieme's little bibliography of French literature in the nineteenth century, originally published in 1897 and itself a useful manual, now appears ten years later in a rich volume of over five hundred pages, enlarged and improved in every sense. Not only has the list of authors increased, but the brief sections on special topics, such as the drama, versification, etc., which contained a few entries each, have grown to an independent second part of about sixty pages. As it now stands Professor Thieme's volume will be an important addition to the working library of the teacher and advanced student and will many a time save the trouble of consulting the more unwieldy and expensive bibliographies. Its value is enhanced by the comprehensive sections devoted to the chief criticisms found in separate volumes, in collections of essays or in periodicals. Thus a large amount of otherwise rather perishable material is made accessible. The list includes a thorough survey of the important English and American as well as continental journals. The periodicals classified form a list of three and a-half pages comprising, Professor Thieme tells us, one hundred and seventy reviews completely indexed, and one hundred and two partly so. The list